

## REMARKS

### Claim Status

Claims 1-5 and 10-12 are pending in the present application. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Claim 1 has been amended to more particularly point out the claimed invention. Support for this amendment can be found in the specification, at, for example, page 4, lines 19-20.

Claims 13 and 14 have been added. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification, at, for example, page 6, line 18, through page 7, line 8.

It is believed these changes do not involve any introduction of new matter. Consequently, entry of these changes is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

### Rejection Under 35 USC §103(a) Over Lassen (U.S. Pat. No. 4,631,062)

Claims 1-5 and 10-12 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious in view of Lassen, U.S. Patent No. 4,631,062. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has failed to set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness in accordance with M.P.E.P. 2143. Specifically, the Office Action has failed to show where each and every element of Claims 1-5 and 10-12 can be found in Lassen, such as, e.g., an absorbent interlabial device that is configured such that the entire absorbent interlabial device resides within the interlabial space of a wearer during use, the absorbent interlabial device having the claimed dimensions.

Applicants further submit that Lassen does not suggest, and in fact, teaches away from, a device configured such that the entire device fits within the wearer's interlabial space. For example, Lassen states at Col. 6, lines 1-5, that "The design of the labial pad of the present invention is such that it requires only partial insertion within the vestibule to be successful, avoiding proximate contact with the more sensitive urogenital portions of the anatomy." As such, it is not clear how Lassen teaches or suggests an absorbent

Appl. No. 10/612,197  
Docket No. AA537C  
Amdt. dated May 20, 2008  
Reply to Office Action mailed on December 20, 2007  
Customer No. 27752

interlabial device that is configured such that the entire absorbent interlabial device resides within the interlabial space of a wearer during use.

Accordingly, because the Office Action fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness in accordance with M.P.E.P. 2143, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and that Claims 1-5 and 10-12 be allowed.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, entry of the amendment(s) presented herein, reconsideration of this application, and allowance of the pending claim(s) are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By

  
Signature

Amanda T. Barry

Typed or Printed Name  
Registration No. 51,435  
(513) 634-4160

Date: May 20, 2008  
Customer No. 27752